

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	0.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/851,689		05/08/2001	Steven Soloff	PD-201017A	3251	
20991	7590	06/02/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
		GROUP INC	BELIVEAU	BELIVEAU, SCOTT E		
PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATION RE/R11/A109				- nm i num	DADED MIN (DED	
P O BOX	956			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
EL SEGUNDO, CA 90245-0956				2623		
				DATE MAIL ED: 06/02/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

. . 6

Application No.	Applicant(s)	1
09/851,689	SOLOFF, STEVEN	
Examiner	Art Unit	
	Air Oille	

Advisory Action	09/851,689	SOLOFF, STEVEN						
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Scott Beliveau	2623						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addi	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 15 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP		•						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened sta above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the safter the mailing date of the final rejection	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2) on, even if timely filed, may	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b) y reduce any					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS								
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);								
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for								
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.								
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a								
the non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.								
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) abjected to:								
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).								
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:								
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)13. Other:								
	AtBIL	Scott Beliveau Examiner Art Unit: 2623						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

Application No. 09/851,689

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant's proposed amendments do not merely cancel claims, adopt examiner suggestions, remove issues for appeal, or in some other way require only a cursory review by the examiner. Accordingly, further search and/or consideration is required on the part of the examiner. For example, applicant's amendent to claim 1 differs in scope from previously presented claim 7 and further creates new combinations of dependent limitations not previously examined.